

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

**IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION
OPIATE LITIGATION**

This document relates to:

*Board of County Commissioners of Atoka
County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case
No. 1:20-op-45001-DAP

*Board of County Commissioners of Caddo
County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case
No. 1:19-op-46156-DAP

*Board of County Commissioners of
Cimarron County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P.,
et al.*, Case No. 1:20-op-45021-DAP

City of Ada vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.,
Case No. 1:19-op-45400-DAP

City of Altus vs. Cephalon, Inc., et al., Case
No. 1:21-op-45046-DAP

*City of Anadarko vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et
al.*, Case No. 1:20-op-45022-DAP

*City of Bethany vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et
al.*, Case No. 1:19-op-46148-DAP

*City of Broken Arrow vs. Purdue Pharma
L.P., et al.*, Case No. 1:19-op-45415-DAP

*City of Edmond vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et
al.*, Case No. 1:19-op-45496-DAP

City of Elk City vs. Cephalon, Inc., et al.,
Case No. 1:21-op-45017-DAP

City of Enid vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.,
Case No. 1:19-op-45717-DAP

MDL 2804

Case No. 1:17-md-2804

Judge Dan Aaron Polster

**PLAINTIFFS' VOLUNTARY
DISMISSAL OF KEYSOURCE
MEDICAL, INC. WITHOUT
PREJUDICE**

City of Guthrie vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45497-DAP

City of Jenks vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45858-DAP

City of Lawton vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45500-DAP

City of Midwest City vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45709-DAP

City of Mustang vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45708-DAP

City of Oklahoma City vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45498-DAP

City of Owasso vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45718-DAP

City of Ponca City vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45495-DAP

City of Seminole vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:20-op-45004-DAP

City of Shawnee vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-46155-DAP

City of Tulsa vs. Cephalon, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:21-op-45024-DAP

City of Yukon vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al, Case No. 1:19-op-45716-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Coal County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45149-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Dewey County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45801-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Grady County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-46167-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Harper County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45757-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45002-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45126-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-46170-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Johnston County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45765-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Kay County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45989-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Kiowa County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45755-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45003-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Le Flore County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45067-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45128-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Logan County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45058-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Love County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45000-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Major County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45990-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Noble County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45129-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Pittsburg County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45711-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45988-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Texas County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45061-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Woods County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:19-op-45987-DAP

Board of County Commissioners of Woodward County vs. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:20-op-45141-DAP

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i), Plaintiffs Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County, Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County, Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County, City of Ada, City of Altus, City of Anadarko, City of Bethany, City of Broken Arrow, City of Edmond, City of Elk City, City of Enid, City of Guthrie,

City of Jenks, City of Lawton, City of Midwest City, City of Mustang, City of Oklahoma City, City of Owasso, City of Ponca City, City of Seminole, City of Shawnee, City of Tulsa, City of Yukon, Board of County Commissioners of Coal County, Board of County Commissioners of Dewey County, Board of County Commissioners of Grady County, Board of County Commissioners of Harper County, Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County, Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County, Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County, Board of County Commissioners of Johnston County, Board of County Commissioners of Kay County, Board of County Commissioners of Kiowa County, Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County, Board of County Commissioners of Le Flore County, Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County, Board of County Commissioners of Logan County, Board of County Commissioners of Love County, Board of County Commissioners of Major County, Board of County Commissioners of Noble County, Board of County Commissioners of Pittsburg County, Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County, Board of County Commissioners of Texas County, Board of County Commissioners of Woods County, Board of County Commissioners of Woodward County, hereby notice dismissal of Defendant Keysource Medical, Inc. from the above-captioned actions.

Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i) provides that a plaintiff may voluntarily dismiss an action without a court order by filing “a notice of dismissal before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment.” Defendant Keysource Medical, Inc. has not served an answer or

motion for summary judgment in these above-captioned actions. The Plaintiff accordingly notices voluntary dismissal without prejudice of Keysource Medical, Inc. from the above-captioned actions.

Dated: April 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

FULMER SILL, PLLC

By: /s/ Harrison Lujan

HARRISON LUJAN, OBA #30154

MATTHEW J. SILL, OBA #21547

1101 N. BROADWAY AVE., STE 102

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73103

PHONE: (405) 510-0077

FAX: (800) 978-1345

EMAIL: msill@fulmersill.com

EMAIL: hlujan@fulmersill.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 14th day of April, 2023, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of the electronic notification of such filing to all ECF registrants.

/s/ Harrison Lujan

Harrison Lujan

Attorney for the Plaintiffs